

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 through 10, 14 and 16 through 20 are pending in the case.

Claims 2, 11 through 13 and 15 have been canceled.

Claims 1, 5 and 14 have been amended.

Original claims 1 through 10 and 14 through 20 have been rejected.

Rejection of the Claims

Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 3, 5 through 10 and 14 through 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by USPN 6,674,233 (Ellen).

Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ellen in view of USPN 6,252,254 (Soules).

Applicant has amended the claims. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections as to the claims as amended.

Each of the independent claims 1 and 14 sets out subject matter not disclosed or suggested by the cited art. Below, Applicant sets out subject matter in each independent claim not disclosed or suggested by the prior art. On the basis of this Applicant believes all the claims are allowable.

Discussion of Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 sets out a light generating device that includes a blue light emitting device. An epoxy is placed over the light emitting device. The epoxy includes a first type of phosphor, and a second type of phosphor. The first type of phosphor, when excited, emits either green light or red light. The second

type of phosphor, when excited, emits yellow light. This is not disclose or suggested by the cited art.

Examiner has suggested this combination is disclosed by Ellen at column 4, lines 11 through 13, column 5, line 36 and column 5, line 51 and column 4 line 23. However, the segments cited by Examiner fail to disclose the subject matter set out in claim 1.

For example, claim 1 sets out a blue light emitting device. However, column 4, lines 11 through 13 disclose use of a UV (400nm) light source.

Further, at column 5, line 51, Ellen does not disclose use of YAG:Ce in a mixture. Rather, Ellen is only indicating the suitability of Ce-doped sialong phosphor for lucoleds and having illumination comparable to YAG:Ce. However, Ellen does not disclose or suggest using YAG:Ce in the described phosphor mixture.

In short, claim 1 describes use of a blue light in combination with a yellow phosphor and either a green or red phosphor. Ellen only describes use of green or red phosphor in combination with a UV light.

Ellen does not disclose or suggest use of green or red phosphor in combination with a blue light. Ellen does not disclose or suggest use of green or red phosphor in combination with a yellow phosphor. So it is clear that Ellen does not disclose or suggest use a blue light in combination with a yellow phosphor and either a green or red phosphor as set out in claim 1.

Discussion of Independent Claim 14

Claim 14 sets out a light generating device. An emitting means emits blue light. A holding means for holds a first type of phosphor and a second type of phosphor adjacent to the emitting means. The first type of phosphor, when excited, emits either green light or red light. The second type of phosphor, when excited, emits yellow light. This is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

Examiner has suggested this combination is disclosed by Ellen at column 4, lines 11 through 13, column 5, line 36 and column 5, line 51 and column 4 line 23. However, the segments cited by Examiner fail to disclose the subject matter set out in claim 1.

For example, claim 1 sets out a blue light emitting device. However, column 4, lines 11 through 13 disclose use of a UV (400nm) light source.

Further, at column 5, line 51, Ellen does not disclose use of YAG:Ce in a mixture. Rather, Ellen is only indicating the suitability of Ce-doped sialong phosphor for lucoleds and having illumination comparable to YAG:Ce. However, Ellen does not disclose or suggest using YAG:Ce in the described phosphor mixture.

In short, claim 14 describes use of a blue light in combination with a yellow phosphor and either a green or red phosphor. Ellen only describes use of green or red phosphor in combination with a UV light.


Ellen does not disclose or suggest use of green or red phosphor in combination with a blue light. Ellen does not disclose or suggest use of green or

red phosphor in combination with a yellow phosphor. So it is clear that Ellen does not disclose or suggest use a blue light in combination with a yellow phosphor and either a green or red phosphor as set out in claim 14.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this Amendment has placed the present application in condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
SU LIN OON
JANET BEE YIN CHUA

By 
Douglas L. Weller
Reg. No. 30,506

September 28, 2005
Santa Clara, California
(408) 985-0642